

0016

Outgoing
c/007/0019
K

From: April Abate
To: Dave Shaver; Karla Knoop
CC: Jim Smith; OGMCOAL@utah.gov
Date: 5/7/2009 2:56 PM
Subject: Water quality reports from 2006
Place: OGMCOAL@utah.gov
Attachments: 0011.pdf; 0010.pdf; April Abate.vcf

Hello Karla and Dave:

These are some older water quality reports that I am sending you. The Division is attempting to get caught up on water quality reporting from previous quarters. My only significant comment requiring some follow up here relates to Well #1 (see Document 11 attached).

Regards,
April

April A. Abate
Environmental Scientist II
Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
1594 W. North Temple, Suite 1210
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
T: 801.538.5214
F: 801.359.3940
M: 801.232.1339

R

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

April 28, 2009

TO: Internal File

THRU: James D. Smith, Permit Supervisor *JS 05/04/09*

FROM: April A. Abate, Environmental Scientist II *AAA 4-28-09*

SUBJECT: 2006 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Andalex Resources, Centennial Mine, C/007/0019, Task ID #3170

The Centennial Mine is currently in temporary cessation. No mining or coal processing activities currently take place there, nor is the site in active reclamation.

The Division is attempting to get caught up with water quality reporting from past quarters. Therefore, the data described within follows the water monitoring plan in the MRP previously located in Sections 711.300 pages 7-2 through 7-10 and Appendix L. Water sampling locations are shown on Figure IV-11.

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?

Springs YES ☒ NO ☐

All six stream sites were monitored in accordance with the water monitoring plan.

Streams YES ☒ NO ☐

All 12 stream sites were monitored in accordance with the water monitoring plan.

Wells YES ☒ NO ☐

Well #1 was monitored during the fourth quarter of 2006.

UPDES YES ☒ NO ☐

All UPDES locations were monitored monthly in accordance with the permit.

Pond

YES ☒ NO ☐

The stock watering pond, 31-1 sampling location was monitored during the fourth quarter of 2006.

2. Were all required parameters reported for each site?

Springs

YES ☒ NO ☐

B351 and S18-1 were the only springs reporting flow this quarter. All required parameters were analyzed for this quarter.

Streams

YES ☒ NO ☐

The only stream sample that reported flow was Summit Creek (SC-1). All required sampling parameters were monitored during fourth quarter 2006.

Wells

YES ☒ NO ☐

Water was measured at a depth of 76.2 feet below ground surface. All other required parameters from this well were measured this quarter.

UPDES

YES ☒ NO ☐

UPDES point UTG040008-004 was the only sample location reporting flow this quarter. All required parameters were measured.

Pond

YES ☒ NO ☐

The stock watering pond was less than 1/2 full this quarter with no outflow reported.

3. Were any irregularities found in the data?

Springs

YES ☐ NO ☒

Streams

YES ☐ NO ☒

Wells

YES ☐ NO ☒

It should be noted that this was the last quarter that groundwater levels were detected in this

well. The pump is reportedly set at 82 feet, which means this well has either dried up or has experienced a drop in water levels of at least 6 feet.

UPDES

YES ☒ NO ☐

Total dissolved solids (TDS) values averaged 1,455 mg/L for UPDES sample 004 this quarter. The 30-day average discharge limitation under the mine UPDES Permit is 500 mg/L. However, the permit indicates that if each outfall cannot achieve a 30-day TDS average of 500 mg/L, then the Permittee is limited to one ton (2,000 lbs) per day as the sum from all outfalls. The Permittee is well within these requirements. Total iron slightly exceeded the 1.0 mg/L standard during the October 2006 sampling event. This is not a concern since the subsequent sampling events showed values below the 1.0 mg/L standard.

Pond

YES ☐ NO ☐

Not applicable this quarter.

4. Did the Permittee make a timely submittal of all data, including initially missing data, and satisfactorily explain irregular data? YES ☐ NO ☐

This does not apply since the data was submitted over two years ago.

5. Does the Mine Permittee need to submit more information to fulfill this quarter's monitoring requirements? YES ☒ NO ☐

6. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

Well #1 remains a listed monitoring point under the newly adopted sampling plan as of March 26, 2009. Groundwater has not been detected in this well since November 2006. The Division and the Operator should have a conversation about Well #1 and address its objectives and future plans.

7. Follow-up from last quarter, if necessary.

None.

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

April 28, 2009

TO: Internal File

THRU: James D. Smith, Permit Supervisor

FROM: April A. Abate, Environmental Scientist II

SUBJECT: 2006 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, Andalex Resources, Centennial Mine,
C/007/0019, Task ID #3169

The Centennial Mine is currently in temporary cessation. No mining or coal processing activities currently take place there, nor is the site in active reclamation.

The Division is attempting to get caught up with water quality reporting from past quarters. Therefore, the data described within follows the water monitoring plan in the MRP previously located in Sections 711.300 pages 7-2 through 7-10 and Appendix L. Water sampling locations are shown on Figure IV-11.

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?

Springs

YES ☒ NO ☐

All six stream sites were monitored in accordance with the water monitoring plan.

Streams

YES ☒ NO ☐

All 12 stream sites were monitored in accordance with the water monitoring plan.

Wells

YES ☒ NO ☐

Well #1 was monitored during the third quarter of 2006.

UPDES

YES ☒ NO ☐

All UPDES locations were monitored monthly in accordance with the permit.

Pond

YES ☒ NO ☐

The stock watering pond, 31-1 sampling location was monitored during the third quarter of 2006.

2. Were all required parameters reported for each site?

Springs and Pond

YES ☒ NO ☐

B351 and S18-1 were the only springs reporting flow this quarter. All required parameters were analyzed for this quarter.

Streams

YES ☒ NO ☐

The only stream sample that reported flow was Summit Creek (SC-1). All required sampling parameters were monitored during third quarter 2006

Wells

YES ☒ NO ☐

Water was measured at a depth of 74.2 feet below ground surface. All other required parameters from this well were measured this quarter.

UPDES

YES ☒ NO ☐

UPDES point UTG040008-004 was the only sample location reporting flow this quarter. All required parameters were measured.

Pond

YES ☒ NO ☐

The stock watering pond was less than ¼ full this quarter with no outflow reported.

3. Were any irregularities found in the data?

Springs

YES ☐ NO ☒

Streams

YES ☐ NO ☒

Wells

YES ☐ NO ☒

UPDES

YES ☒ NO ☐

Total dissolved solids (TDS) values averaged 1,580 mg/L for UPDES sample 004 this quarter. The 30-day average discharge limitation under the mine UPDES Permit is 500 mg/L. However, the permit indicates that if each outfall cannot achieve a 30-day TDS average of 500 mg/L, then the Permittee is limited to one ton (2,000 lbs) per day as the sum from all outfalls. The Permittee is well within these requirements.

Pond

YES ☐ NO ☐

Not applicable this quarter.

4. Did the Permittee make a timely submittal of all data, including initially missing data, and satisfactorily explain irregular data? YES ☐ NO ☐

This does not apply since the data was submitted over two years ago.

5. Does the Mine Permittee need to submit more information to fulfill this quarter's monitoring requirements? YES ☐ NO ☒

6. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No actions are recommended since these data are over two years old.

7. Follow-up from last quarter, if necessary.

None.